UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,735	08/17/2001	Dinesh C. Verma	YOR920010700US1	6228

7590 03/21/2007

Law Office of Ido Tuchman
69-60 108th Street
Suite 503
Forest Hills, NY 11375

EXAMINER	
AILES, BENJAMIN A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2142	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/932,735	VERMA, DINESH C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin A. Ailes	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to correspondence filed 05 January 2007.

2. Claims 1-32 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Callaghan et al. (US 2002/0007317), hereinafter referred to as Callaghan, in view of Rosenberg et al. (US 6,073,241), hereinafter referred to as Rosenberg.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing

that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Regarding claims 1, 11, 14, and 21, Callaghan teaches a method comprising employing a first web server in a first DNS domain, and a second web server in a second DNS domain (p. 3, par. 0050), wherein the first web server uses a first user tracking mechanism to collect client information (p. 3, par. 0049 and 0050). Callaghan teaches the storage of information (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and p. 8, par. 0117) but does not explicitly teach the storing of the client information as a client record in a database. Also, Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly recite the limitations of "the first web server directing a client to access a resource at the second web-server", "said resource encapsulating information about a location of the client record in the database", "the second web server decapsulating the location and retrieving the client record from the database", and "the second web server using the client record in conjunction with a second user tracking mechanism", however in related art, Rosenberg teaches on these limitations. Rosenberg teaches the use of a database wherein an entry is created by a first web server, the entry is identifiable by a unique identification value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of servers in the network (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record entry in the database to each appropriate server (col. 5, ll. 26-30. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a

combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

5. Regarding claim 2, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first and second user tracking mechanisms use cookies for storing the user client information (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0043). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 2.

6. Regarding claim 3, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first web server authenticates the client, and the client record includes user authentication data enabling the second web server to use a common sign-on with the sign-on of the first web server (Callaghan, p. 6, para. 0085-0087). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 3.

7. Regarding claim 4, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first web server stores within the client record at least one parameter which determines at least one characteristic of at least one page to be sent to the client by the second web server (Callaghan, p.1, para. 0004-0005). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 4.

8. Regarding claim 5, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the parameter includes at least one user preference (Callaghan, p. 1, para. 0004-0005). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 5.

9. Regarding claim 6, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein said at least one user preference is related to at least one detected purchasing habit (Callaghan, p. 1, para. 0005).

The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 6.

10. Regarding claim 7, Callaghan teaches a method comprising employing a first web server in a first DNS domain, and second web server in a second DNS domain (p. 3, para. 0049-0050), enabling said first and second web servers to share cookie information (p. 3, para. 43); and coordinating cookies across said first and second domains (p. 3, para. 0046-0049).

Callaghan teaches the storage of information (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and p. 8, par. 0117) but does not explicitly teach the storing of the client information as a client record in a database. Also, Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly recite the limitations of "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database", however in related art, Rosenberg teaches on this limitation. Rosenberg teaches the use of a database wherein an entry is created by a first web server, the entry is identifiable by a unique identification value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of servers in the network (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record entry in the database to each appropriate server (col. 5, ll. 26-30. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

11. Regarding claim 8, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the step of coordinating is performed by a cookie coordinator accessible to said first and second Web-Servers (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0046-0049). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 8.

12. Regarding claim 9, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising providing a cookie coordinator accessible to said first and second Web-Servers to perform the step of coordinating (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0046-0049). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 9.

13. Regarding claim 10, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the step of enabling includes the first web server setting a first cookie having a first identity and the second web server setting a second cookie having a second identity, and the step of coordinating maps the first and second identities to a third identity shared across said first and second domain (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053-0056). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 10.

14. Regarding claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 22, in accordance with claims 1, 7, 1, 7, 11, and 21, respectively, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means... (Callaghan, p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

15. Regarding claim 18, Callaghan discloses a method comprising employing a first web server in a first DNS domain, and a second web server in a second DNS domain, wherein the first web server maintains a first private cookie at a browser and the second web server maintains a second private cookie at the browser (p. 3, par. 0049 and 0050, p. 4, 0053 and 0054); accessing

a cookie coordinator when the first private cookie is received by the first web-server (p. 4, para. 0056); mapping a first identity in the first private cookie and a second identity in the second private cookie to a single identity common across the multiple domains (p. 4, para. 0053).

Callaghan teaches the storage of information (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and p. 8, par. 0117) but does not explicitly teach the storing of the client information as a client record in a database. Also, Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly recite the limitation of "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database", however in related art, Rosenberg teaches on this limitation. Rosenberg teaches the use of a database wherein an entry is created by a first web server, the entry is identifiable by a unique identification value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of servers in the network (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record entry in the database to each appropriate server (col. 5, ll. 26-30. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

16. Regarding claim 19, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising using the single identity to look up the identity of users across the different domains (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053), and the cookie coordinator learning the mapping of the various cookies that are placed independently on the browser by the different servers (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053). The

rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 18 applies equally as well to claim 19.

17. Regarding claim 20, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the use of a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions... (Callaghan , p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 18 applies equally as well to claim 19.

Regarding claims 23, 25, 27, and 29, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising wherein the database is a cookie coordination database (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 11-15); and wherein directing the client to access the resource at the second Web-Server includes sending the client a link to the second Web-Server (col. 5, ll. 25-30).

18. Regarding claims 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, and 32, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein directing the client to access the resource at the second Web-Server includes sending a HTTP response code from the first Web-Server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second Web-Server using HTTP redirection. (Callaghan, see page 3, paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well known HTTP technology methods). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claims 1, 7, 14, 18, and 21 applies equally as well to claims 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, and 32.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER